

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 23, 2008. Claims 2-5, 16, 25-30, and 37 have been cancelled herein, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 6, 17, 31-36, 38-40, and 44 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10, 11, 13, 23-36 and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0069143 to Cepeda (“Cepeda”). Claims 9, 14, 15, 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cepeda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,144 to Barrett et al. (“Barrett”), and claims 12, 16-18, 37-39, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cepeda in view of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0212358 to Walker et al. (“Walker”).

As indicated above, independent claims 1, 24, and 40 have been amended to further clarify several additional features, as described more fully below. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, “accessing expense data for one or more expense types associated with a travel destination, a departure time, and a return time; computing an initial average expense for one or more of the expense types associated with the travel destination, the departure time, and the return time; accessing service ratings for one or more items corresponding to one or more expense types; accessing context data associated with the travel destination, the departure time, and the return time; sorting the one or more items based on the service ratings and the context data . . . receiving a user selection of an item corresponding to an expense type; entering expense data for the item; computing an updated average expense for the expense type associated with the item based upon the expense data for the item; calculating a difference between the updated average for the expense type and the initial average for the expense type; and providing a reward to the user based upon the difference.” Independent claims 24 and 40 recite similar limitations.

The applied reference is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest the foregoing features recited by independent claims 1, 24, and 40. Cepeda discloses a system utilizing a web-based interactive database to automate the allocation of the operating expenses. *See Abstract*. Once business units are defined, product categories under the business unit are created to track

operating expenses by each product category. *See* paragraph 0036. An organizational structure is utilized in allocating operating expenses. *See* paragraph 0037. The system allocates operating expenses to the business unit's processes, compute the average deal cost, and calculates the deal cost per product by adjusting the average deal cost to reflect complexity differences between products. *See id.*

Cepeda is completely silent on any disclosure of travel data much less any expenses data for one or more expense types associated with a travel destination, a departure time, and a return time. Cepeda also does not disclose at least "accessing expense data for one or more expense types associated with a travel destination, a departure time, and a return time; computing an initial average expense for one or more of the expense types associated with the travel destination, the departure time, and the return time; accessing service ratings for one or more items corresponding to one or more expense types; accessing context data associated with the travel destination, the departure time, and the return time; sorting the one or more items based on the service ratings and the context data . . . receiving a user selection of an item corresponding to an expense type; entering expense data for the item; computing an updated average expense for the expense type associated with the item based upon the expense data for the item; calculating a difference between the updated average for the expense type and the initial average for the expense type; and providing a reward to the user based upon the difference," as recited in amended independent claim 1, as well as independent claims 24 and 40.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent claims 1, 24, and 40 are allowable over Cepeda.

Furthermore, Barrett does not remedy the deficiencies of Cepeda. Specifically, Barrett discloses checking expense entries for compliance with policy rules and detecting the possibly of fraud. *See Abstract.* Walker also does not remedy the deficiencies of Cepeda. Walker discloses a product-pricing database in which a full price and discount prices corresponding to one or more discount pricing tiers are stored for each product available for sale. *See Abstract.* Neither Barrett nor Walker disclose "accessing expense data for one or more expense types associated with a travel destination, a departure time, and a return time; computing an initial average expense for one or more of the expense types associated with the travel destination, the departure time, and the return time; accessing service ratings for one or more items corresponding to one or

more expense types; accessing context data associated with the travel destination, the departure time, and the return time; sorting the one or more items based on the service ratings and the context data . . . receiving a user selection of an item corresponding to an expense type; entering expense data for the item; computing an updated average expense for the expense type associated with the item based upon the expense data for the item; calculating a difference between the updated average for the expense type and the initial average for the expense type; and providing a reward to the user based upon the difference," as recited in independent claims 1, 24, and 40.

According, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent claims 1, 24, and 40 are allowable over Barrett and Walker.

The other remaining claims in the application are each dependent on independent claims 1, 24, and 40 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the disclosure, individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, and the entire application is fully in condition for allowance and such action is courteously solicited.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Leila R. Abdi  
Reg. No. 52,399

Date: April 10, 2008

1180 Peachtree Street, N.E., 21st Floor  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
Telephone: (404) 892-5005  
Facsimile: (404) 892-5002